

MARIN COUNTY CONGESTION MANAGEMENT AGENCY

CENTRAL MARIN COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING ACTION MINUTES SEPTEMBER 17, 2003

Members Present: Susan Adams, Rocky Birdsey, Al Boro, Damon Connolly, Joy Dahlgren, Don Dickenson, Welcome Fawcett, Tom Hinman, Phil Kranenburg, Roger Smith, Bob Sonnenberg, and Harriot Manley

Members Absent: Lan Kauffman and Patrick Murphy

Staff Present: Dean Powell, Marin County Department of Public Works; Bonnie Nelson, Congestion Management Agency Consultant; and Kara Vuicich, CMA Consultant

Others: Craig Tackabery, Assistant Director, Marin County Department of Public Works; Andy Preston, Interim San Rafael Public Works Director; Eric Anderson, Marin County Bicycle Coalition; Peter Montgomery

The meeting was convened at 4:06 p.m.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

2 APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES OF AUGUST 20, 2003

M/s, Adams/Sonnenberg, to approve the August 20, 2003 action minutes with the following modification:

- Page 2, 1st bullet, 2nd sentence – Change to read, “Committee members suggested an allocation in the 40-60% range with the majority of members in the 50-60% range.”

Motion passed unanimously.

3. REVIEW OF THE 1998 BALLOT MEASURES A AND B AND 2000 AND 2001 POLLING DATA

For committee consideration in developing final recommendations (see Agenda Item 7 below), Hinman highlighted several findings from a previously distributed Nelson/Nygaard memorandum dated September 13, 2001 concerning “Lessons Learned from Successful Measures.” He noted that the San Rafael Chamber of Commerce is interested in cost-effective programs and projects and is concerned how regional traffic issues will be handled. He also noted the importance of updating the polling data with new surveys relevant to the current plan approach.

Staff briefly highlighted campaign messages and issues from the 1998 Measures A and B, as well as polling data from an April 2000 baseline survey and a follow-up, December 2001 survey commissioned by the CMA concerning a possible transportation sales tax ballot measure.

4. FOLLOW-UP TO FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS FROM LAST MEETING

Staff passed out a revised page 6 of the FAQ’s due to an error in the reported Local Streets and Roads funding gap. Staff noted that the original numbers only included non-pavement costs and that the revised numbers included both pavement and non-pavement costs, which translates into a total shortfall of about \$11.8 million/year for Marin.

In response to questions and comments raised concerning the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Local Streets and Roads projects, staff confirmed that: (1) any re-paving or maintenance type project must comply with ADA requirements; and (2) ADA compliance is listed as a “non-pavement” cost. There was also a related discussion on estimated costs to subsidize paratransit, including the use of accessible taxis.

5. REVIEW OF CORRESPONDENCE TO THE COMMITTEES

In response to comments in the agenda packet made by Mike Arnold concerning school trips, Adams noted the importance of determining the percentage of school trips on Highway 101 during the morning commute period, and she suggested polling schools, especially private schools, high schools, and area colleges, to see if they have data on file to help determine the percentage.

The committee also noted the numerous e-mails and letters concerning Paradise Drive in the agenda packet and questioned whether the committee should continue recommending the removal of that portion of Paradise Drive south of Trestle Glen Boulevard from the “short list” of Roadways of Countywide Significance, which would receive high priority in the expenditure plan. It was noted that any committee recommendation to this issue should be included in discussion of agenda Item 7.

6. PRESENTATION ON THE LOCAL RETURN ELEMENT AND REVIEW OF GUIDANCE AND DIRECTION OF THE CMA/BOS JOINT COMMITTEE

Staff presented information on the guidelines and general direction of the CMA/BOS Joint Committee for the Local Return element of the draft Transportation Sales Tax Expenditure Plan. On behalf of the Joint Committee, staff was seeking community input on: (1) the preliminary allocation of 10-25% of the sales tax revenues towards the Local Return element; (2) whether there should be restrictions on the use of Local Return funds; (3) how often and by what process Local Return spending priorities are updated; and (4) a sense of local projects in the community that should be given high priority.

Committee discussion and public comment topics included: (1) whether Local Return funds can augment other draft Expenditure Plan elements or, conversely whether these funds can be limited to specifically exclude augmenting any Plan element; (2) whether or not a maintenance of effort requirement should be included; (3) why a maintenance of effort requirement may be difficult on a city or town, unless some sort of flexibility is provided to those cities with bond measures for transportation improvements; (4) how communities select and prioritize Local Return projects; (5) whether Local Return funds are discretionary or binding; (6) the importance of maintaining flexibility, such as the ability to change priorities locally every few years; (7) the importance of local match fund leveraging and the ability to bond to deliver projects earlier; (8) whether unspent funds could be accumulated year to year; (9) how projects are evaluated and eligible project criteria; and (10) illustrative examples of possible Local Return projects. Information on some of these topics can be found in the “Frequently Asked Questions #4” handout in the October staff report packet.)

Sense of the Committee – The committee arrived at a general consensus on the following:

- Committee members preliminarily suggested allocations for the Local Return element ranging from 12.5 to 20% (16.9% average, 15% median).

General Local Return Recommendations:

- Local jurisdiction should have discretion in determining Local Return projects.
- A local citizen’s advisory committee should be formed to oversee expenditure of Local Return funds.
- Specific procedures should be outlined for determining Local Return projects, which includes maximum community input opportunities.
- Some Local Return funds should be reserved specifically as local match funds.
- Unexpended Local Return funds should be allowed to accumulate.
- Provisions should be included to allow communities to work together to jointly leverage Local Return funds and implement larger projects.
- There should be a clear distinction between Local Return and Local Streets and Roads projects.
- Projects that can be delivered in the first five years should be highlighted in the expenditure plan.
- “Easy” projects should be delivered early so people see immediate, positive results of the measure.
- A maintenance of effort requirement may want to be considered, which should provide flexibility to those cities with bond measures for transportation improvements.

Recommendations for Criteria for Evaluating Local Return Projects and Programs:

- Eligible Local Return projects should be evaluated against the following criteria:
 - The “leveragability” of outside funds
 - Project ability to reduce or manage congestion, such as impact on Levels of Service
 - Project readiness
 - Projects that help achieve General Plan transportation goals
 - Projects that are neighborhood-based
 - Projects that increase the use of technology for traffic management and improve use/capacity of existing infrastructure
 - Projects that emphasize alternative modes, including Transportation System Management measures

Recommendations for Illustrative Examples of Local Return Projects:

- Bike and pedestrian paths that link communities should be a priority. Examples are:
 - Access to the Canal area
 - Shoreline Pathway
 - The North-South Bikeway
 - Terra Linda Promenade
 - ADA improvements and compliance
 - Implementing projects and improvements of existing community bike/pedestrian plans
- Traffic improvements that enhance safety, improve mobility, and reduce congestion should be a priority. Examples are:
 - Transportation System Management measures that improve use/capacity of existing infrastructure
 - 3rd Street and Union Street intersection improvements
 - Miracle Mile improvements

7. REVIEW AND FINALIZE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEES

Committee discussion and public comment topics included: (1) the timing and schedule for a ballot measure and whether November 2004 is still too early; (2) the goals of increasing mobility, managing congestion, and enhancing safety of the Transportation Vision and draft Expenditure Plan; (3) whether programs and projects are intended to reduce or manage congestion; (4) focusing recommendations on worthwhile programs and projects that meet the goals of the plan, not just to get the vote; (5) the impact of this plan on Highway 101 traffic, including the impact of local congestion management projects and the strategy of using local funds for local projects, thereby freeing up federal and state funds for regional projects; and (6) the importance of timing and delivery of projects.

Sense of Preliminary Plan Allocations of the Committee – Committee members were polled on possible allocations for the remaining expenditure plan elements, which revealed the following information:

- Committee members preliminarily suggested allocations for the School Access element ranging from 10 to 20% (16.1% average, 15% median).
- Committee members preliminarily suggested allocations for the Local Streets and Roads element ranging from 10 to 25% (17% average, 17.5% median).
- Committee members preliminarily suggested allocations for the Local Transit element ranging from 40 to 60% (51% average, 50% median).

The committee did not complete their discussion on finalizing recommendations and continued consideration of this item to the next meeting agenda. (See agenda Item 10 below.)

8. APPOINT REPRESENTATIVES TO PRESENT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AT THE JOINT COMMITTEE OCTOBER WORKSHOP

The committee did not discuss this item and continued consideration of it to the next meeting agenda. (See agenda Item 10 below.)

9. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None.

10. CONFIRM/SCHEDULE NEXT MEETING DATE (IF NECESSARY), TIME, AND JOINT COMMITTEE OCTOBER WORKSHOP DATE, TIME, AND LOCATION

One additional committee meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, October 1st, at 4:00 p.m. in the Community Room of the California State Automobile Association offices to develop, synthesize, and finalize committee recommendations for all elements.

Note: The Joint Committee October workshop has been confirmed for Saturday, October 18th, at 1:00 p.m. in the Marin County Civic Center Board of Supervisors Chamber.

Chair Connolly adjourned the meeting at 6:58 p.m.